HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 52 Monday, December 29, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

GOP: *Why the "liberals" erupted*.....(page 1)

These Republicans came back alive.....(page 2)

HIGH COURT: *Will Frankfurter step down?* (page 1)

ROCKEFELLER: *Left of the Democrats* .....(page 3)

SPECIAL: *Report on the German crisis* .....(page 4)

Behind the 'Liberal' Putsch: Cold cash, in the amount of $30,000, sparked the recent "liberal Republican" attempt to seize the GOP leadership in the Senate. Behind the talk of making Vermont's Senator George Aiken the Minority Leader there lay some well-financed political wire-pulling and maneuvering. This fact is well-known to insiders in the Capital; what isn't yet known is exactly how the money was spent, or whether all of it has already been disbursed.

According to inside information relayed to HUMAN EVENTS, *the $30,000 was raised in New York at a meeting of Park Avenue "liberals" right after the November election. The names of the leaders of the group are known but cannot be disclosed at the present time. These include some of the same "liberals" who manipulated the nomination of Eisenhower in 1952; and they are, with some exceptions, the same who sought, after Ike's re-election in 1956, to create a "Republican Advisory Council," corresponding—in ideology and function—to the Democratic Advisory Council, which has pushed the Democratic party further left and has got in the hair of the Democratic congressional leadership.*

(This latter Modern GOP venture in imitating the Democrats failed because GOP National Chairman Meade Alcorn strenuously opposed the notion. Alcorn, who became Chairman early in 1957, was strongly influenced by conservative members of Congress. A similar project for a GOP Advisory Council is now being pushed again by the "liberals.")

Carrying on in the same groove, the "liberal" Republican group met a little more than a month ago, and, after some hosannas for Nelson Rockefeller, agreed on three conclusions: (1) "We have the Supreme Court"; (2) "we have the President—his anti-radical campaign talk of last fall is a passing phase"; and (3) "the next move is to take over the leadership of the Republican party in the Senate." Then they passed the hat for a $30,000 slush fund to send political-action agents to Washington and other places where the drive for Aiken as GOP leader (or, if not Aiken, Cooper of Kentucky) could be set in motion.

The political agents and their sponsors made several mistakes. They assumed they had the President in their pocket. But Eisenhower, since the departure of Sherman Adams from the White House, has been much less under the influence of "liberalism" than previously. Also, the President has the "anti-radical" and "anti-spending" idea still prominently in mind, however weak and half-hearted he seems in actual performance. Finally, the "liberals" failed to foresee the influence which Senator Styles Bridges (N.H.), the most powerful GOP conservative in Congress, could wield over the President. Ike, after a talk with Bridges, got Senator Thruston Morton (Ky.) to make a public statement which was interpreted as a body blow to the "liberal" drive. Whatever may be the final verdict of conservatives on the President's proposed Budget cuts, the fact is that he is now talking about $77 billion, not $78 or $80 billion, as heretofore—a distinct movement to the right.

Supreme Court: Prolongation of the illness of Justice Felix Frankfurter, which has caused his absence from the Court and from official functions in the past month, has aroused speculation as to the possibility of his retirement. If Frankfurter's seat becomes vacant, attempts to forecast his successor will inevitably follow. Such figuring —unfortunately—will have to take into account the likelihood of a choice based on geographical, ethnic or religious reasons, rather than on knowledge of the law and experience on the bench. But such are the realities of politics.

Those who ruminate about a possible successor to Frankfurter, should his seat become vacant, have come up with a couple of names. In view of the fact that the Court is packed with "liberals" of various sorts, and that no conservative Southerner is among the Nine, some think, in the interests of fairness, that a Southern traditionalist should be named.

Prominent among those who fit this qualification is Senator John Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi. The Senator is a former member of the bench and his career in the upper house has been marked by judicial bearing and utterance.

Another name that appears in this connection is that of Judge Irving R. Kaufman, of the Federal bench in the Southern District of New York. Kaufman presided over the trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the atom spies, and when the jury returned a verdict of guilty, did not shrink from invoking the supreme penalty for their crime. His statement sentencing the Rosenbergs to death (the first such sentence for espionage ever carried out in any major civil case) has been described as a masterpiece of firm justice: "Your crime is worse than murder. Who knows but that millions more may pay the price of your treason. . . . " Judge Kaufman is known among his colleagues as a thoroughgoing anti-Communist; as such, he would doubtless improve the present Court, with its continuing spate of "Red Monday" decisions.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Capital Comment: More clarification of the projected visit of Soviet official Anastas Mikoyan to the US has proceeded since last week, when HUMAN EVENTS exclusively broke the news that the Red Commissar was headed here to obtain industrial machinery on a long-term loan. In the past 48 hours few contend—as they did a week ago—that the Mikoyan trip will have anything to do with solving the Berlin crisis. The "Armenian" never touches diplomacy; his exclusive field is industry and trade.

News reports accumulate to the effect that the economic situation in the Soviet Union has taken a bad turn, and that Mikoyan's list of needed items of machinery (which Senator Hubert Humphrey accommodatingly brought from Moscow to the State Department) would bolster sagging Soviet production, which has recently been under additional burdens, owing to trade pacts with such "underdeveloped" nations as India, Indonesia, Burma, *etc.* In short, the Soviet Union is industrially "overcommitted," and Mikoyan's job is to get the American taxpayer to foot the bill.

The reason for all the haste may be gathered from an article in Ordnance *(November-December issue), entitled "Soviet Machine Tools," by Joseph A. Gwyer, author of numerous industrial studies of the USSR. Gwyer remarks: "A cursory examination of available data shows that either the replacement of outmoded equipment or modernization (rebuilding) of machine tools practically does not exist in the USSR. During the past ten years, few if any machine tools were scrapped and replaced by new units, and only about 60,000 machine tools were modernized. The modernization consisted primarily of increasing spindle speeds and power, and hardly touched the mechanization and automation of equipment. . . . "*

Political Briefs: Culbert Olson—California's last Democratic chief executive preceding Governor-elect Pat Brown and a far-out left-winger—had this comment last week on the results of the elections: "Knowland was absolutely correct when he said a Republican loss would mean socialism for California, and [ex-President] Hoover is right, too, when he talks about 'creeping socialism.' It is socialism—any form of economic planning."

● At the same time that the Administration is working to represent its foreign-aid program as an item so vital to our program of national defense that it is practically a military necessity, Congressman John Rooney (D.-N.Y.) reveals that a substantial sum is going for a purpose 180 degrees in the other direction. Rooney discloses that over $3 million of foreign-aid funds has been transferred to USIA, so that this agency can sponsor a "Peace Fair" next year in Moscow.

National Communism: The left wing's infatuation with "national communism," as personified in the Communist regimes of Yugoslavia's Tito and Poland's Gomulka, continues unabated. Last week, the State Department concluded a deal to send $95 million worth of agricultural produce to Yugoslavia; total aid to this Communist regime, economic and military, now runs close to $2 billion.

The new grant came scant weeks after a former US Government official, familiar with Yugoslavia, had blasted Tito as a tool of the Kremlin. In a staff consultation with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, former US Information Service official Alex Dragnich (now professor of political science at Vanderbilt University) declared that Tito is "a most valuable . . . agent of communism," who "helped international communism when it needed it most."

Charging that "politically, ideologically, psychologically, morally . . . Tito and his comrades feel that they are on the side of the Soviet Union," Dragnich pointed out that Tito has repeatedly supported Moscow in international disputes, and that therefore neither military nor economic aid to his dictatorship is justified.

● A similar blast was levelled at the Gomulka regime in Poland—which runs second in the "liberal" poll of favorite Communists—by Senator John Marshall Butler (R.-Md.). Butler forecast recently that Congress would prohibit help to the Red dictatorship as giving "aid and comfort to the enemy." He recommended that further Administration action on Polish aid be held up until Congress could "consider the desirability of pouring more of our taxpayers' money into another Communist rathole." (In spite of American outlays of $193 million to them in recent months, the Red Poles have openly lined up with Moscow on all matters under dispute between the USSR and the free world—including the slaughter in Hungary.)

Bound Volumes for 1958—indexed—may now be ordered for March delivery. Regularly $15. The special pre-publication price of $7.50 will be accepted until December 31. These handsome volumes make a valuable addition to your library. Volumes for 1955, 1956 and 1957 available at regular price ($15).

Election Post-Mortem: Political experts—studying the election returns as a guide for GOP strategy in this session of Congress—are finding new lessons in their survey of the results. For example, syndicated columnist Holmes Alexander argues that those GOP Congressmen who engaged in political "aggression" in the last Congress came through to victory, while more timid souls in the same states were defeated. He cites the examples of the "research" and "response" task forces of the GOP Congressional Committee, whose job it was to dig up refutation of Democratic charges against the GOP, and then to stand up on the floor of the House and trade punches with the opposition.

In the "research" group were six legislators—John Ray (N.Y.), Robert Wilson (Calif.), Gerald Ford (Mich.), John Rhodes (Ariz.), Thomas Curtis (Mo.) and John Byrnes (Wis.)—all of whom won re-election. In the "response"—or front-line—group, were 12 additional Congressmen, 10 of whom won re-election. The 10: Frank Becker (N.Y.), Jackson Betts (Ohio), Elford Cederberg (Mich.), Edgar Hiestand (Calif.), Perkins Bass (N.H.), William Cramer (Fla.), Steven Derounian (N.Y.), Joe Holt (Calif.), Glenard Lipscomb (Calif.), Keith Thomson (Wyo.).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alexander's conclusion: "You usually get hurt when you're running away."

● Meanwhile, "liberal" columnist Thomas O'Neill of the Baltimore *Sun* theorized that independence of the White House seemed to be an important ingredient in successful Republican campaigns. Five Republican Congressmen, he noted, voted against all three of Ike's "must" list of legislative proposals (foreign aid, reciprocal trade and Pentagon reorganization). O'Neill observed: "The five (Representatives James B. Utt of California, William G. Bray of Indiana, Alvin E. O'Konski of Wisconsin, and Clare E. Hoffman and August E. Johansen of Michigan) sailed to re-election while other Republicans in their states were being slaughtered."

Rockefeller: Definitive commentary on "Republican" Nelson Rockefeller was forthcoming this week from a far left-wing group called "The Committee for an Effective Congress." This organization, which interlocks with the collectivist "Americans for Democratic Action" (ADA), issued a report hailing Rockefeller as "a new specter haunting Washington," and proclaiming that his emergence "has had a liberalizing effect on everybody." The Democratic Advisory Council (an ADA-type appendage of the Democratic National Committee), said the report, has been forced to become even more "liberal" than formerly "by the realization that the Democratic party is in danger of being outflanked on the left."

When the CFEC issues a statement sanctifying one politician as more left-wing than another, it knows whereof it speaks. The organization is itself an adjunct of the "liberal" Democratic movement, and its Board of Advisors has included such left-wingers as Democratic Congressman James Roosevelt, former New Republic editor Michael Straight, Arthur E. Schlesinger, Jr., and Archibald MacLeish (both speechwriters for Adlai Stevenson), New Deal official Sumner Welles and ADA Chairman Robert R. Nathan.

The Second Senator Byrd: Speculation is rife in Washington over what will happen when 15 newly elected "liberal" Democrats assemble in the Senate for the first time. It is predicted that at least one of these newcomers will strike an independent course. He is Senator-elect Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia—a man that many in the Capital feel could develop into a spokesman on foreign affairs possessing some of the stature that his namesake, Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia, has when he speaks on matters of domestic policy.

The new Senator Byrd presumably will not follow along in the path of such appeasement-minded Democrats as Hubert Humphrey. At the height of left-wing agitation for a Summit conference with Khrushchev last spring, Byrd delivered a fiery denunciation of all varieties of appeasement and "coexistence" apologetics. He scored the results of such "top-level" conferences as the World War II meetings at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam, and the disastrous Geneva conference of 1955.

"It is most disturbing," Byrd said, "to look back upon the fruitless Geneva conference of 1955 and to wade one's way through the sea of phony claims being made for another Summit conference. Having followed the British appeasement will-o'-the-wisp to disaster before, our country today finds itself in an Alice-in-Wonderland atmosphere being created with reference to international realities." Communist tyranny, the new Senator concluded, could not be stopped by soft words, but only by the free world's making clear that "it will battle to the death any aggressor."

● Although Byrd has established a "liberal" record on a number of domestic programs, the record shows that he also thinks for himself on issues other than Summit conferences. As a Member of the House last session, he voted against "reciprocal trade," in favor of cutting foreign aid and in favor of two measures to counteract the left-wing rampage of the Supreme Court. And in an interview this week in *US News and World Report,* he comes out for further foreign-aid reductions, decreased Federal expenditures, and respect for the rights of the several states: "I feel that sometimes we may be going too far in enabling the Federal Government to force the states to act in certain directions."

Book Event: *A Guide to Anti-Communist Action,* by Anthony T. Bouscaren; Henry Regnery Company, $4.

Those engaged in fighting communism often have resort to a large body of theoretical literature, explaining Marxist doctrine and exposing its fallacies; and they have also benefitted from considerable work at the practical level by congressional committees and departments of patriotic organizations such as the American Legion and the VFW. In a new book, *A Guide to Anti-Communist Action,* Anthony Bouscaren has combined the virtues of both methods, and produced a valuable textbook on communism and the best means of combatting it.

Bouscaren's chief message is that we must abandon the forlorn hope of "coexisting" with communism, and set about to destroy it. In foreign affairs, he points out, this means adopting a policy of "liberation," aimed at freeing the captive people behind the Iron Curtain; in domestic affairs, it means an unremitting effort to clean subversives out of Government, to identify and expose Communist fronters and fellow-travellers who mouth the Kremlin's line, and to promote anti-Communist books and periodicals.

This is a pioneer effort in uniting, within the covers of one compact volume, the broad range of Marxist theory and the hard facts about Communist aggression, foreign and domestic. It is a book which every anti-Communist should buy and read.

CLARENCE BUDINGTON KELLAND, noted writer and former Republican National Committeeman from Arizona: "HUMAN EVENTS is an eloquent voice. May you hold back the waters of socialism until a better dawn shall come."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Lesson of Berlin: No Appeasement For Germany

By DR. Z. MICHAEL SZAZ

THE CURRENT CRISIS over Germany—producing the landslide West Berlin vote against appeasement of communism—serves to confirm a fact which this writer observed at first hand a few months ago: that the "liberal" image of a German population, and of Europeans generally, yearning for "peace at any price" with communism, is completely out of focus. This was the conclusion I reached this fall after a two-month lecture tour through the German Federal Republic and West Berlin. The overwhelming majority of the people that I talked with there—even before tensions were sharpened by the present dispute over Berlin—favored a "tougher" American policy toward the Soviet Union.

Whatever the composition of the audiences—whether they were GI's, officers, grass-roots citizens' assemblies, youth groups, academic leaders, officials of local and state governments, Catholic or workers' groups—the basic question asked was always: Will the United States stand up to its obligations in case of armed Communist aggression?

For, despite the NATO commitment and the presence of our forces on German soil, many Germans still look suspiciously upon American policy. They are worried lest the softening of the line sought by homegrown "liberals" will sacrifice them to communism in the name of "peaceful coexistence." The lessons of Yalta and Potsdam and the subsequent sellouts have not been forgotten in Germany, where 25 per cent of the country was given to Poland and the Soviet Union, and over 15 per cent of the population was expelled, perished or forced to flee to the West.

The average German's immunity to communism is very high, and his aversion to the Soviet Union is almost axiomatic. Communists are virtually nonexistent in the Federal Republic, save for some agitators from East Germany. The party has been outlawed since 1956, and there is a definite feeling that West Germany is exercising an almost magnetic influence on the Soviet Russian zone, rather than vice versa.

The greatest danger to the Western cause is not subversion, but the potential apathy of the masses. The youth are slowly overcoming the pacifist, anti-national spirit which was taught to them as the pinnacle of democratic thinking by some of the New Dealish officers of the military government in the late 'forties. The new German recruits and young officers realize now that the defense of their country against the Soviet Union is the primary task.

Secretary of State Dulles is not the target of popular resentment in Germany. His policies are generally supported, and even his critics understand the reasons for his actions. The average German is definitely not anti-American and shows an understanding of the global commitments of the United States. As a German lieutenant-colonel expressed it: "It is no fun for Americans to fight in God-forsaken lands for freedom, in order to prevent Communist subversion."

The party of Chancellor Adenauer, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), has achieved an almost unparalleled power in the last two years on both the Federal and state levels. There are also several very able and experienced men in the cabinet who can take the place of the aging conservative statesman and preserve the general direction of his defense and economic policies. Minister of Defense Strauss, a militant fighter against the Communist danger both from without and within, and Minister of Economics Erhard, the father of Germany's economic recovery and an ardent believer in free enterprise, are the two likeliest candidates.

Owing to the continued partition of Germany and the increased flight of the population from the eastern zone, reunification of East and West Germany is the perennial topic of the day. The call for more hard-hitting propaganda and political action becomes increasingly stronger in order to hasten the day of delivery for the 17 million subjugated East Germans.

ONE SORE POINT in German-American relations is repeated with frequency: the failure of the United States to return German private property confiscated at the outset of World War II. At least ten times out of twenty, this question was raised, and it was hinted that perhaps the United States nurtures no friendly feelings toward Germany. The Germans point out the inconsistency of our paying billions of dollars in grants and low-interest loans to doubtful neutrals and Communists like Tito and Gomulka, while refusing to return private German assets worth scarcely more than 200 million dollars which would almost balance the claims of American citizens against the Reich, so that it would hardly be more than a paper transaction from the Treasury's point of view. (See the HUMAN EVENTS article, "Do We Believe in Private Property? If So, Enemy Alien Assets Must Be Returned," by Senator Roman L. Hruska, August 18, 1958.)

The average, politically conscious German knows little about the intricacies of American party politics, but for him, Secretary of State Dulles, Senator Bridges, and other conservatives, in calling for a resolute policy toward the USSR, represent the only hope of his country against the Communist danger. For he has no illusions about appeasement. As a German professor has put it: "Without NATO and American guarantees, I could not write my present book; I would be doing forced labor in a Soviet slave camp by now." His warning is valid for us, too, lest we get apathetic.

Dr. Z. Michael Szaz is editor of the magazine, *Free World Forum*, and author of the forthcoming book, *Germany's Eastern Frontiers* (Regnery).

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.
For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* — JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 52 HUMAN EVENTS December 29, 1958

Article Section I

Letter to an Isolationist

BY WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

DEAR JOHN: You and I were both opponents of United States involvement in the Second World War. Now you reproach me for having become an "interventionist" while you remain true to "isolationist" principles. I welcome this opportunity to try to clarify my position.

First of all, I have never shifted my ground in regarding Franklin D. Roosevelt's policy of "lying," rather than "leading" America into war in 1941 (I borrow the phrase from Clare Booth Luce) as disastrous folly. Indeed, the end result of this policy, aiming as it did at the total political and military destruction of Germany and Japan and thereby promoting the ascendancy of the Soviet Union as the one strong power in Europe and Asia, is, I am convinced, the source of our major perils and difficulties in the foreign field today.

At the same time I believe it is no idle crusading interventionism, but an imperative condition of national security and probably survival as a free Nation, to throw the full weight of our political and, when necessary, our military power into the scales against the expansion by armed force of aggressive imperialist communism, whether its center be in Moscow or in Peiping. To be more specific, I was in favor of resisting the Soviet attempt to starve West Berlin into submission. I think we were right in fighting to defend Korea in 1950; our mistake, in my opinion, was in settling for a draw instead of adopting General McArthur's prescription for victory.

I also applaud President Eisenhower's repudiation of any "Far Eastern Munich" and the generally firm stand on the Quemoy and West Berlin issues of Secretary Dulles. My hope is that we are not so ill advised as to bargain away the offshore islands after the Chinese Nationalists, with our timely and efficient aid, have put up such a gallant and successful defense.

If this be interventionism, make the most of it. I have never regarded either isolationism or interventionism as a religious creed, to be adhered to at all times and under all circumstances. Each should rather be regarded as a policy to be followed or rejected, depending on whether it serves or harms the overriding concern of American national security.

It was and is my belief that there was an honorable and feasible means of avoiding American involvement in the Second World War. This was to shape our policy toward the objective of promoting a Kilkenny Cats' Fight of the two great murderous dictatorships, Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia, the twentieth century Vandals and the twentieth century Huns.

I have never seen any serious evidence that Hitler wished to invade, occupy or destroy England, much less to attack the United States, a country about which he seems to have known little and cared less. His eyes were fixed on eastward continental land expansion, not on overseas empire. Decisive proof that the Soviet Union was his main objective is furnished, I think, by the fact that he launched his great offensive against Russia even after he was already at war with Great Britain.

THERE WAS A similar possibility of avoiding involvement in the Far Eastern side of the war. Suppose we had decided to let the Japanese, the Soviet Russians, the Chinese Nationalists and the Chinese Communists fight it out to their hearts' content without intervening in the struggle ourselves. Can anyone be sure that the result of such a policy would have been less favorable to our interests in that part of the world than the situation we face today—a militarized, implacably hostile Communist China, and Japan as a weak and understandably somewhat reluctant ally?

As I interpret the world situation today, there is no such element of choice in our foreign policy as we possessed in the critical years, 1939-1941. (At that time it would not have been difficult, had American policy set its course on the Kilkenny Cats' Fight of dictatorships—not on ultimately backing the possibly more dangerous of these dictatorships against the other—to have won the enthusiastic cooperation of Great Britain under Neville Chamberlain and France.)

Now, whether we like it or not, we are in the front line. We are in the finals of a match in which the penalty for losing will be our disappearance as a free and sovereign Nation. One cannot criticize too severely the abysmal folly of Roosevelt's foreign policy. But one also cannot escape the situation which this folly created, the necessity for holding two fronts, in Europe and in Asia, against Communist aggression.

There is another great change which, I believe, rules out reversion to old fashioned American isolationism, comforting and desirable as such a reversion may seem. This is the transformation of the nature of war by the rush of scientific discoveries of enormous military significance. Surely the idea of limiting American defense to our Atlantic and Pacific coasts, waiting until we see the whites of our enemies' eyes, sound enough in the nineteenth century, is merely absurd in an age of nuclear weapons, supersonic aircraft, ballistic missiles.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some critics describe our foreign policy position as "over-extended" and there are suggestions that communism might obligingly curl up and die if we would stop "encircling" the Soviet Union with our far-flung bases. But is seems to me that former conceptions of what is strategically essential and defensible must be radically revised in an age when every year, almost every month, brings some new spectacular triumph of human invention over time and space. As for the overseas bases, I have never met a competent American military authority who did not regard these as an absolutely essential key factor in American national security.

Along with nuclear weapons these bases represent the most effective counterweight to the superiority of the Soviet and Red Chinese empires in mobilized manpower. No wonder the Soviet rulers have been pulling out every diplomatic stop in an effort to get rid of these two obstacles to the realization of their dream of world domination!

As for the suggestion by many "liberals" that the Communist masters of Russia and China are innocent lambs, subjected to attack by American imperialist wolves, it would not be difficult to prove that every aggressive move since the end of the war has been initiated by the Communist side. Surely it was the Communists who blockaded West Berlin, not we who blockaded East Berlin. It was a North Korean army, fitted out to the last machine gun bullet by the Soviet Union, that invaded South Korea, not the other way around.

One of the most amazing pieces of brainwashed, prejudiced thinking I have read for a long time appeared in the left-wing British weekly, *The New Statesman*. In a leading article melodramatically entitled "The Rim of Hell," this publication described the crisis in the Strait of Formosa without even mentioning incidentally that this crisis assumed acute form only when the Chinese Reds began massive bombardment of Quemoy, with the objective of cutting off the island from supplies and forcing it to surrender. Nor was there any recognition of the fact that Eisenhower and Dulles have repeatedly assured the Chinese Communists that they can have a cease-fire whenever they stop shooting. *The New Statesman's* idea about Nationalist China and America could perhaps be summed up in the line from a French fable:

"That animal is very wicked; it defends itself."

I dislike the things that accompany a state of chronic international high tension—conscription, Government support of the economy, high taxes—as much as you do. But I feel certain that these evils would be aggravated beyond imagination if we should quit under the impact of Communist violence and atomic blackmail, call back the Sixth Fleet to cruise around Nantucket and the Seventh Fleet to patrol San Diego, and abandon the network of mutual insurance alliances which we have concluded in Europe and in Asia.

The inevitable result of such a course, I am convinced, would be a Communist takeover of a large part of the world, including some highly industrialized countries and large reserves of raw material. The balance in manpower and resources would tilt decisively against us. We would be isolated in a very unpleasant way, as a besieged city is isolated. We would find ourselves working desperately hard under iron regimentation on a vastly lower standard of living than we enjoy at present, and with no hope of victory, only a dubious prospect of mere survival.

MOST ISOLATIONISTS before June, 1941, when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, and almost all isolationists after that date, were anti-Communists. Many, although not all interventionists in the 1939-41 period were, if not inclined to fellow-traveler views, at least culpably blind to the looming menace of a Soviet colossus bestriding Europe and Asia. Now a changed situation calls for some modification of former prepossessions. The former isolationist must accept the fact that a really isolationist policy today would serve the interests of communism. The interventionist of World War II days must recognize that the Soviet Union, far from being a worthy partner in a glorious anti-fascist crusade, is now America's Enemy Number One, a totalitarian state which matches Hitler in ferocity and surpasses him in cunning.

Whichever camp Americans may have belonged to before Pearl Harbor, present conditions dictate the following conclusions: The world has become too small for a big country like the United States to hide in. In the face of the undisguised Communist ambition to conquer the world by force, subversion, or a mixture of the two, there is no peace in appeasement, no safety in retreat, no security in cowardice.

Sincerely,

William Henry

William Henry Chamberlin is a prominent journalist and the author of many books and articles on foreign affairs. His book, *America's Second Crusade* (Regnery), is regarded as one of the outstanding half-dozen works debunking the interventionism that pushed America into World War II. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The Issue is *Not* Quemoy," October 6, 1958.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "LETTER TO AN ISOLATIONIST" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 52 HUMAN EVENTS December 29, 1958

Article Section II

THE NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

Where Is It Leading American College Students?

BY M. STANTON EVANS

CLAIMING TO REPRESENT a million or so American college students is an organization known as the "United States National Student Association" (NSA). NSA is a "confederation" of student governments on about 400 American campuses. Its primary purpose appears to be that of providing a forum through which—by the upward filtration of the representative system—the one million students can voice their feelings on subjects they find pressing.

A charge sometimes aimed at the group is that, while having only the most tenuous claim to actual representation of its million "members," it insinuates itself, in their name, into political controversies where it does not belong. This charge is supported by NSA's record of political interventionism, and by statements it has issued as to its supposed function.

Writing in the May, 1958 issue of the *National Student News*, Robert Kiley, now President of NSA, offered the view that "if we are to hold to the thesis that college life contributes to the development of more intelligent citizenship, then we must assume that students should be directed to a greater social awareness." Kiley urged "that student government devote prime efforts toward the creation of an atmosphere conducive to developing student awareness and understanding of national and world situations."

If this meant simply a campaign to promote political "awareness" in general, regardless of the kind of awareness, criticism of NSA might be somewhat less vehement. But NSA, in its function as a two-way transmission belt for political ideas, means to advance one sort of political ideas only—and those of the left-wing variety.

NSA's policy pronouncements, worked up for adoption at its annual jamborees, are models of "liberal" sloganeering. It has, for example, come out in favor of Federal aid to education, and against the discharge of Communist teachers. Its politicking has included formal attacks on "McCarthyism"—as in its convention of 1951—and opposition to loyalty oaths for students in the Naval ROTC—as in a 1949 statement by the NSA executive committee.

In addition to its own policy declarations, NSA has demonstrated its political leanings by its many affiliations with the "liberal" movement in America. On its 1957-58 letterhead, as participants in its 13-man advisory council, are listed six of America's most illustrious left-wingers: Ralph Bunche, Erwin Canham, Reinhold Niebuhr, Walter Reuther, Harold Stassen and Eleanor Roosevelt. In one of its promotional brochures, NSA proudly proclaims its connections with the leftist American Council on Education, UNESCO and the NEA.

NSA's propaganda efforts on behalf of Federal aid have been nothing short of heroic. Last year's President, Ray Farabee, went before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to push for Federal aid to college students. The *National Student News*, NSA's official publication, pounds away indefatigably at the subject. Its obsessive concern with money does much to confirm the tedious accusation levelled at today's college students—that they are rank materialists.

> **For example, in five issues of the News that I have before me as I write, there are no less than 33 separate stories dealing with finances—12 of them in a special supplement entitled "Rising Costs Squeeze Colleges, Students." Of these articles, 13 in one way or another promote the idea of Federal assistance to college students. That works out to an average of four finance stories per issue, or more than six per issue if we average in the special supplement; and to better than two pro-Federal aid stories per issue.**

NSA has tried, with notable lack of success, to shake the "left-wing" accusation—principally by appealing to testimonials from important people in public life. One of NSA's stock arguments is that it has been okayed by a report of three deans' organizations, and that it has fought Communist-dominated youth groups. An evaluation of NSA handed down by the "NSA Liaison Committees" of the National Association of Deans of Women and two other groups said that NSA "is not now, nor does it appear to be in danger of becoming Communist or leftist-dominated. On the contrary: NSA has spearheaded and led the mobilization of the unions of students of the free world in combatting the propaganda and distortion of truth fostered by the Communist International Union of Students."

NSA itself claims to have "refused affiliation with the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth because of the partisan political roles of these Soviet-dominated organizations. . . . Consistently, USNSA has condemned the policies and activities of both the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth . . . "

THIS MODE of argument is doubly misleading. First, because it attempts to substitute the issue of *Communist* domination for the issue of *left-wing* domination; second, because it is not a full presentation of the facts about the Communist issue. NSA is to be credited for its current opposition to IUS. But its opposition has not always been so strong.

In its 1947 constitutional convention, NSA voted to affiliate with IUS, provided that certain conditions were met by the international organization. IUS at that time was headed by Joseph Grohman, a Czech Communist. When the 1948 Red coup occurred in Czechoslovakia, NSA's European represen-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tative wired home asking "public condemnation of and disaffiliation from IUS," in protest against that group's acquiescence in Communist violence. Although NSA answered this request by cabling "NSA confirms," it now argues that "disaffiliation" was impossible, since the affiliation had not been consummated in the first place. Whatever merit may be conceded to this argument, the amicable IUS-NSA relationship of 1947 is quite different from the eternal hostility now pictured by NSA.

The use made by the Communists of the "affiliation" vote may be guessed. The National Republic Lettergram *reports that, on the occasion of NSA's 1947 conference, "the Communist* Daily Worker *gleefully headlined the news, 'Students Vote Affiliation to World Body,' and stated under a Madison dateline that 'the National Student Association today voted 401 to 35 to affiliate to the International Union of Students, because such contact may lead to an arresting of that deterioration of relations between the US and other countries now creating a serious threat to the peace of the world.'"*

In a statement which was inserted into the *Congressional Record* by Congressman John Bell Williams (D.-Miss.), veteran researcher J. B. Matthews analyzed the NSA record on internal security issues. Matthews noted NSA's formal opposition to loyalty oaths and unspecified "abuse" of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, as well as its defense of professors who invoked the Fifth Amendment before congressional committees.

From his inspection of NSA, Matthews comes to these two stern conclusions: "(1) that the policies and program of the USNSA embrace the important lines of the Communist party insofar as these touch upon the questions involved in student life and activity on the campuses of American colleges and universities; and (2) that the adult leaders, speakers, and advisers of the USNSA represent a high degree of left-wing and pro-Communist infiltration of the organization." (*Congressional Record,* July 14, 1958.)

Even if one accepts this strong indictment by Dr. Matthews, of course, one does not thereby impeach the motives of the NSA founders and officials. It is a sad truth that many well-intentioned "liberal" groups are vulnerable to just such an accusation. The parallel takes on significance only in view of the fact that NSA has maneuvered itself into a position of speaking for college-age America.

THE ONLY CAUSE which NSA promotes more ardently than additional funds for students is additional power for its constituent organizations. In doing so, it talks a lot about the "changing function" of student governments. The new role envisioned for these organizations is to invade the territory of the school administration and faculty. An NSA pamphlet states: "If it is assumed that the college is a laboratory for training in citizenship, it is to be thought of as a community-structured unit . . . The students not only need the experience of helping develop the policies which will affect their lives while in college, but they should have some voice in the development of curriculum and in the evaluation of instruction." The pamphlet explains that "the basic objective of students participating in the administration of an institution is to help them to be ready to face society. . . . [it] gives students a chance to not only learn the democratic processes but to experiment with them."

While NSA pays lip service to the idea of promoting excellence in studies, it never makes clear how student tinkering with the curriculum will achieve this goal; nor does it advance any other specific recommendations that would improve the quality of scholarship. It views the campus as a breeding ground for bureaucrats and organization men, rather than as a place where the intelligence is disciplined by deep and rigorous study.

NSA's grandiose plans become even more disturbing when we consider the qualifications of these dynamos of "awareness" for superintendence of the curriculum, as revealed in their numerous pronouncements on university matters:

- Manifest in the writing of NSA spokesmen are the very evils which the group, by its program stressing the "new dimensions of student government," is toiling to promote. NSA pamphlets are clogged with awkward, indistinct terms—"community-structured unit," for example—that betray indistinct ideas.
- As for grammar: there are few infinitives so tightly constructed that NSA cannot split them. A 1956 NSA working paper argues the need for a special subcommission, "*to,* under the supervision of the National Office, *revise and bring up to date*" an NSA brochure called "Course Evaluation."
- The January, 1958 issue of the *National Student News* tells us that, unfortunately, "student government, control, responsibility and programming" are sometimes "non-existant"—which might be viewed as a typographical error, had not the previous month's *News* disclosed that low-cost housing near UCLA was also "non-existant."
- An NSA pamphlet explaining the "student bill of rights" quotes that document as holding certain conditions "indispensible" for a suitable education.
- An NSA form letter, recently mailed, "endorces" the Youth March for Integrated Schools.

These errors, gathered in a few moment's rummaging through NSA material, are not to be condemned too harshly. The writers, after all, are only students. Such boners assume significance only when we recall that the people capable of committing them are the very people who want to horn in on the formation of the curriculum.

All of which suggests that if NSA's student politicians spent more time studying, and less bigwigging, they might make a far more valuable contribution to the cause of American education.

M. Stanton Evans is the Managing Editor of HUMAN EVENTS.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED